1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 - - - - X 3 : 21CV6160 (KAM) 4 NICOLE DAVIS, 5 Plaintiff, 6 : United States Courthouse : Brooklyn, New York -against-7 8 BANANA REPUBLIC, LLC, : April 5, 2022 : 4:30 p.m. 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR PRE-MOTION CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE KIYO A. MATSUMOTO 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 14 15 APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiff: FITAPELLI & SCHAFFER, LLP 16 28 Liberty Street, 30th Floor 17 New York, NY 10005 BY: BRIAN SCHAFFER, ESQ. 18 DANA MARIE CIMERA, ESQ. MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 19 For the Defendant: 101 Park Avenue New York, NY 10178 20 BY: NICOLE M. ZITO, ESQ. 21 22 Court Reporter: SOPHIE NOLAN 23 225 Cadman Plaza East/Brooklyn, NY 11201 NolanEDNY@aol.com 24 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription 25

	Telephonic proceedings 2
1	(Via teleconference.)
2	(The Honorable Kiyo A. Matsumoto, presiding.)
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This is a telephone
4	pre-motion conference, docket 21CV6160, Davis versus Banana
5	Republic LLC.
6	Will counsel on behalf of the plaintiff state your
7	appearance, please.
8	MR. SCHAFFER: Sure, Brian Schaffer and Dana Cimera
9	from Fitapelli & Schaffer. Good afternoon, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Who will be speaking on behalf of the
11	plaintiffs today?
12	MR. SCHAFFER: Mr. Schaeffer.
13	THE COURT: Please, sir, whenever you speak and I
14	will say the same to defense counsel, please identify yourself
15	by name. We can not see you, so we need to know who is
16	speaking.
17	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: And who is here for the
18	defense, please?
19	MS. VITO: Good afternoon. This is Nicole Vito from
20	Morgan Lewis on behalf of the defendant Banana Republic.
21	THE COURT: You said Nicole
22	MS. VITO: Vito, V-I-T-O.
23	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
24	MS. VITO: Good afternoon.
25	THE COURT: So I reviewed the amended complaint

Telephonic proceedings

which I understand there's some dispute as to whether it was filed properly and I have reviewed the pre-motion conference letters.

So let's first address the amended complaint which I understand has been filed, you know, out of time, but even if I did grant the defendant's motion or whether I granted defendant's motion, I think that I would most likely grant leave to the plaintiff to have filed this amended complaint. So can we assume for purposes of today's discussion that we're operating from the amended complaint?

MS. VITO: Yes, we have no objection to operating with respect to the amended complaint. This is Ms. Vito and we assumed that any motion would be against the amended complaint.

THE COURT: Great. I appreciate that. So we will deem the amended complaint filed and it will be the operable complaint for purposes of the defendant's proposed motion.

So I appreciate the letters that were provided and the authorities, but I must say that I do not agree respectfully with the defendants that the plaintiff or other members of the putative class do not have standing. I think that the case law -- you know, this is not a mere statutory violation without standing which is -- without injury, which is what *TransUnion* and that line of cases was addressing.

Here we have really a minimal earner who does manual

Telephonic proceedings

labor who I guess her two-week paycheck attached to the amended complaint indicated she earned for that two-week period \$200 and change. It was very modest and I think multiple cases have held that the late payment is and does state a sizable injury that would be sufficient to give the plaintiff standing. So I don't think that that is a basis on which the defendant would be successful in moving to dismiss. I just think the case law is really trending the other way and I would look to the many cases where the Courts have found an injury based on a violation of the New York Labor Law Section 191, especially if a laborer is deprived, even for a week or two, of the earned wages.

The second issue that the defendant wanted to move on was the private right of action argument. That the plaintiff has no right to a private right of action under New York Labor Law section 191-1-a. Again, it seems that two appellate courts in New York have held that there is a private right of action for such claims and it appears also that other federal courts have looked to New York State Appellate courts to determine whether there is a private right of action.

Vega, which is the case that the parties are focusing on here, does state that there is a private right of action and even if the New York Court of Appeals hasn't ruled definitively on the issue, we have the decision which many courts within the Second Circuit have followed.

SN OCR RPR

Telephonic proceedings

So, again, I hate to say this, but and I appreciate the defendant's well-crafted pre-motion conference letter, but I don't believe there is going to be success on this motion.

So, I am suggesting instead -- and, in any event, regardless if the defendant proceeds with the motion, that the parties appear before Judge Scanlon and try to resolve this case.

Right now it's a class defined as The New York Class and the plaintiff defines them, you know, with some precision. I believe that there are sufficient factual grounds for a Rule 23 class action. I don't know whether the plaintiff would be open to settling this case based on the claims stated for this plaintiff or whether I would think it would be in most -- it would be in the defendant's and the plaintiff's interest to settle, you know, for the entire class and there might have to be some discovery on that point.

Which brings me to the third point, the defendants had asked me to stay discovery which I am reluctant to do because I don't think the motion is likely to succeed. So it doesn't appear to me that the parties have ever appeared for a settlement conference before a magistrate judge and I would urge you to do that before you engage in motion practice and that you try to resolve this.

Is that something that the parties would be willing to do? I was going to refer you to Judge Scanlon for a settlement conference.

SN OCR RPR

Telephonic proceedings

MR. SCHAFFER: Thank you, Your Honor, this is
Mr. Schaffer for plaintiff. I can tell you that plaintiff's
counsel did reach out to defense counsel, I want to say it
could have been the day we filed the complaint. We know this
firm and these attorneys well and we've had cases with them in
the past. Since the day I filed this case I have been
suggesting, you know, a private mediation to try and resolve
this case. Defendants did tell me that they were in the
process of gathering class-wide data but that their client
hadn't made a decision whether they wanted to go forward with
the class-wide mediation.

It would be our preference to use a private meditator rather than the magistrate judge in this case only because in these cases a mediation could be all day, ten or twelve hours, and we think a private mediation would be better suited for this case.

THE COURT: Well, that's fine. We do have mediators who are available through the courts. It's generally in the context of an FLSA claim. I know this is a state law claim based on diversity and I'm assume, although I should really clarify, from Banana Republic they are an LLC, I don't know who the principals are of the LLC and I know in a class action diversity is somewhat more relaxed, but who are the principals of the LLC? Do we know their citizenship and who they are?

MR. SCHAFFER: From plaintiffs point of view, I

Telephonic proceedings

think the company is owned by Gap, Inc.

THE COURT: Yes, but that doesn't tell us -- go ahead.

MR. SCHAFFER: I think it's wholly-owned by Gap Inc. is what I believe, but Nicole would have more --

MS. VITO: This is Nicole Vito. It's a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Gap, Inc. and The Gap is a publicly traded company and I think the case is in federal court on CAFA jurisdiction.

THE COURT: It's an acronym. And I think that's accurate that you have asserted jurisdiction. It's the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, also known as CAFA, 28 United States Code Section 1332(D).

So, the parties have no dispute that there is subject matter jurisdiction and we haven't found a reason to find there is none. So, look, how do the defendant's feel about private versus magistrate judge settlement? I understand the length of time that will be needed to get this case settled and I respect your choice to engage in private mediation. It may be more expensive than appearing before a magistrate judge that won't charge you. I can't speak for Judge Scanlon at this point what her schedule is, but I would want you to try to settle this before engaging in motion practice because, again, with due respect to the defendants, I don't think this is likely to succeed.

Telephonic proceedings

MS. VITO: This is Nicole Vito. The Banana Republic position has been reluctant to engage in class-wide settlements, but I can take back the Court's directive and the Court's guidance with respect to the motion and whether they would be interested in revisiting the idea of mediating. I think that they would probably prefer private mediation.

We've had a number of cases where plaintiffs' counsels have said -- where we've worked together and we've used private mediators to resolve it. So I will check with them on their position with respect to that, but I echo what plaintiff's counsel says.

THE COURT: All right. I am not advocating one thing or another. I am offering free mediation services by our wonderfully effective magistrate judges, but private mediation is fine and I want to be clear that I'm not pushing the parties one way or the other to settle this case on individual or a class-wide basis. I just think if I were a defense lawyer, I would want class-wide peace, but I don't know what the numbers really are for laborers employed by Banana Republic in New York who were affected by this pay policy which violates New York Labor Law. I don't know what the numbers are.

Do you have an idea, Ms. Vito?

MS. VITO: Over the six-year period in the aggregate? I don't know sitting here offhand what the scope

Telephonic proceedings

of the class would be now.

THE COURT: Do you have a ballpark? Is it in the tens of thousands? Just an approximation.

MS. VITO: Yes, I think it would depend on who was in the class because manual worker is defined fairly broadly. If it's just sales associates, probably at least 1,000 over a six-year period but that's a ballpark estimate that I wouldn't want to be held to.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me do this, then; I am requesting to refer you for mediation. I would like you to act promptly to arrange for that and then I would ask you to keep me abreast on how that's progressing. So, for example if you both feel that you've exhausted your options at settlement before a mediator you could always get back in touch and say maybe we'll try with the magistrate judge or maybe the defendant will have reevaluated its position regarding motion practice. We will, as I said, deem the operable complaint to be the amended complain and to the extent discovery is needed for, really, to advance litigation and/or to understand the class, I would not issue a stay of discovery.

Now, Magistrate Judge Scanlon will be supervising any discovery and if in her discretion she finds there is a reason to stay the case, she can do that, but I don't think as I sit here now and given what I perceive as a motion that's not likely to succeed, it doesn't seem to me to be appropriate

SN OCR RPR

	Telephonic proceedings 10
1	to stay discovery at this point. So if I were to urge you or
2	order that you arrange for the private mediation and hopefully
3	get it completed within two months and report back to me.
4	Could you do that?
5	MR. SCHAFFER: That works for plaintiff Your Honor,
6	this is Mr. Schaeffer.
7	MS. VITO: This is Ms. Vito. That works for the
8	defendants.
9	THE COURT: So I am going to ask for a status report
10	within two months, 60 days. Today is April 5th. So that
11	brings us to June 6th and there will be a joint status report
12	on the outcome of the private mediation, okay?
13	MR. SCHAFFER: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	MS. VITO: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'm glad you
16	worked together on many cases. It's always a pleasure when
17	lawyers get along and work together to benefit their clients.
18	Anything further?
19	MR. SCHAFFER: No, Your Honor.
20	MS. VITO: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: We're adjourned.
22	
23	(Matter adjourned.)
24	- 00000 -
25	